

**JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD**

**ORIGINAL**

DATE: July 8, 1998  
TIME: 7:00 P.M.  
PLACE: Ripley Elementary School  
Versailles, IN 47042  
PRESENT: Paul Cloud, Co-Chair  
Richard Hill, Co-Chair  
Karen Mason-Smith  
Krista Duncan  
Brooks Evens  
Mike Early  
  
Sharon Shields, Reporter  
  
Audience Members

---

**Sharon Shields**

*S.A.S. Reporting Service*

3650 N. Old SR 62, Madison, IN 47250

Business: (812) 265-2994

Fax: (812) 273-5220

1           A public hearing of the Jefferson Proving Ground  
2 Restoration Advisory Board meeting was held in the Ripley  
3 Elementary School at Versailles, IN at 7:00 P.M. on July 8,  
4 1998.

5  
6  
7           **OPENING STATEMENTS BY MR. RICHARD HILL:**

8           My name is Richard Hill. I'm the community  
9 ah co-chair of the Restoration Advisory Board. Here on my  
10 right is Paul Cloud. I'm sure you've all seen us and heard  
11 us before. So here we are again. If you have an agenda you  
12 can see we have agenda handouts over here on the table. Ah  
13 we just found our - some of our high tech equipment is down  
14 tonight so we won't be able to show you all the beautiful  
15 slides but that's okay. I think we can get by without it.  
16 Ah I don't need to read the agenda to you. I would just  
17 like to welcome everybody that is here and ah see if Paul  
18 has any opening remarks before we get into the meat of the  
19 thing tonight.

20  
21           **OPENING STATEMENTS BY MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

22           Thank you Richard. I don't have much to say  
23 other than as Richard has already identified that the  
24 projector that I normally use with the computer to show the

1 presentation and I was also going to use tonight to show you  
2 the Jefferson Internet web site has malfunctioned and is not  
3 available. So what I would encourage you to do is follow  
4 along in the handouts that we have and then at your leisure  
5 before you leave you can look at some of the poster boards  
6 we have here. Those are some of the actual pages off of the  
7 Internet for this Jefferson Proving Ground web page. And we  
8 are starting to up date now and make minor changes. But  
9 there is a mechanism in that where you can make comments to  
10 us and we can respond and then make changes from that also.  
11 Ah what I would like to do now is turn the meeting over to  
12 Mr. Brooks Evens from the Corps of Engineers of Louisville  
13 district who will talk to you a little bit about the  
14 environmental status at Jefferson Proving Ground. Brooks?

15  
16 **STATEMENTS BY MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

17 Thank you. My name is Brooks Evens. As  
18 Paul said I'm with the Corps of Engineers. I've been with  
19 the Corps for the last three (3) years. I'm a project  
20 scientist for Jefferson Proving Ground. Ah as you can see  
21 on the handout I gave to you ah slide two (2) was going to  
22 be a great big outline and I will jump to slide three (3).  
23 As I said my name is Brooks Evens. I'm a project scientist  
24 on the project. I am involved in environmental technical

1 aspects of the project. In the Louisville district we have  
2 what we call project managers which is the central person  
3 Paul Cloud, Mike Early go to when they ask questions. Paul  
4 comes to them and say I need this done. John comes down to  
5 me and says can you write this scope of work? Can you do  
6 this government estimate and take the project on through.  
7 Ah supporting me is Karen Rabek who is a geologist. She's  
8 been with the government for about fifteen (15) years. Our  
9 chemist is Sami Mansy. He's a Ph.D. He was the QA/QC lab  
10 manager in ORD lab and has quite a bit of experience with  
11 all the ah SW-846. That's a book that outlines how to do  
12 procedures for analytical methods. And our technical QA\QC  
13 person is Mike Saffran. He's been with the Corps for  
14 fifteen (15) years. He's a civil engineer working towards a  
15 Ph.D. engineering degree. And he has years outside the  
16 government working for a private consulting too. So he has  
17 a broad range and ah he makes sure that the work with the  
18 Corps he does is in line with what is expected of the Corps.  
19 If we don't do a good job we hear it from Mike and Paul,  
20 maybe not doing a good job and need to pick it up. Ah slide  
21 four (4) was a like a little diagram stating the lines of  
22 communication and where it comes from. It comes from Paul  
23 down to John Briggs and from Briggs, John Briggs, there's a  
24 number of areas that he goes to like counselors, our

1 attorney, contracting for all the contracts we have going  
2 on, construction, engineering, cost estimating, civil  
3 engineering. John Briggs is the key focal point that keeps  
4 the Corps moving forward. Ah slide five (5) is a little bit  
5 of history of how the Corps came into JPG. Ah the Army  
6 Environmental Center which had all the RI/FS work which  
7 we're going through now, remedial investigation/feasibility  
8 study, which is going on since 1990 got transferred to the  
9 Corps in June of 1997 a fund to start managing the RI/FS in  
10 January of 1998. The Corps has been managing this project  
11 for the last seven (7) months at the time of the report and  
12 what we inherited from the RUST's RI/FS which is an eight  
13 million dollar (\$8,000,000) contract and we have about a  
14 million (\$1,000,000) left in that contract to finish up the  
15 feasibility study which gets us to a point of saying this is  
16 how we are going to clean up what's left at JPG and that's  
17 basically how much it's going to cost. We also inherited an  
18 SAIC which was another consultant's work, implemented work  
19 plan, involving ten (10) sites that the Army, EPA and IDEM  
20 felt be pulled out of the RI and be cleaned up because of  
21 the small size of the project. And we also inherited  
22 various UST construction projects that everybody knows if  
23 you are around storage tanks they are a wonderful piece of  
24 environmental work. Ah past construction projects that the

1 Corps has overseen on the construction end have been UST  
2 projects, mainly through 1995 and 1997. We've overseen the  
3 biotreatment cells which is we've biomediated the  
4 contaminated soils from underground storage tank instead of  
5 taking them to a landfill for disposal. And we've also done  
6 some of the interim measure work plan sites like site seven  
7 (7) which is the red lead area. Like fourteen (14) which is  
8 yellow sulfur area, like fifteen (15) burn pad area, site  
9 twenty-six (26) which is a burn area in the cornfield. And  
10 we've done site twenty-eight (28) and twenty-nine (29) in  
11 the Gator Z mine area. Construction projects for 1998 have  
12 been sites eight (8) and forty-two (42), the indoor firing  
13 ranges and site twenty-five/twenty-six (25/26) is the Paper  
14 Mill Road disposal area. Ah site twenty-five (25) and  
15 twenty-six (26) wasn't originally in the interim measure  
16 work plan but to facilitate the property transfer to IDOT we  
17 agreed to do - to get this project taken care of so that we  
18 could finish transferring that area. Ah the project status,  
19 the Army has received concurrence from IDEM for closure of  
20 sites seven (7), fifteen (15), twenty-six (26), twenty-eight  
21 (28) and twenty-nine (29). The Army is awaiting concurrence  
22 from EPA for same sites. There's ah additional information  
23 on those sites that EPA is wishing to gather from us. And  
24 let's see. EPA and IDEM both indicated that additional

1 material will be required to remove from site fourteen (14)  
2 which is the yellow sulfur area. And that reasoning is we  
3 have PH levels that are still below the acceptable levels.  
4 We have a few metal hits there still above ecological and  
5 human health numbers that are acceptable to both EPA and  
6 IDEM. We still have four (4) UST removal actions going on  
7 in buildings 103, 310, 167 and 127. And other sites - other  
8 UST sites have all received closure from IDEM and they are  
9 safe to be transferred when the property is ready to be  
10 transferred. Ah the project status on the RI, the RUST  
11 Environmental has completed the phase II on our report and  
12 the draft report will be presented to the regulators on  
13 August 7. It covers twenty-six (26) sites, some of which  
14 are in the interim measure work plan sites. We did pull  
15 them out of the RI because the phase II work was moving into  
16 the long interim measure work plan. We've included our  
17 confirmation sampling results in with the RUST phase II RI  
18 and hopefully those sites referred will be taken out of the  
19 RI report. Ah RUST has begun the feasibility study and  
20 after our review we have eleven (11) sites moving forward  
21 through the feasibility study. Now that has not been  
22 confirmed. IDEM and EPA will have a say if they concur with  
23 our conclusions and everything that we did through the RI.  
24 Ah completion and concurrence by the - by the regulators is

1 expected by this time next year on the RI/FS report. That  
2 leads us to slide ten (10) which says what's next? The next  
3 step after RI/FS is to prepare the proposed plan and the  
4 Record of Decision. Ah the proposed plan is where the Army,  
5 along with concurrence from EPA and IDEM present a plan that  
6 says we are going to dig and haul this. We are going to  
7 make a landfill path. We are going to sta - stabilize and  
8 solidify other stuff. That will all be worked out in the  
9 feasibility study and the proposed plan will outline what  
10 we're going to do for all sites the Army's required to clean  
11 up. And after we do that proposed plan we will go the  
12 regular decision which is everybody: the Army, EPA, IDEM  
13 sign - sign that document which commits everybody,  
14 especially the Army, to provide funds to get those sites  
15 cleaned up. The Army expects to let the proposed plan and  
16 Record of Decision contract early next fiscal year. The  
17 Army hopes to have a signed ROD by early to mid fiscal year  
18 2000. And when the ROD and that comes out we will have a  
19 thirty (30) day comment period for the proposed plan which  
20 the public can comment on what the Army plans to do. At  
21 that point voices, people, RAB and public really need to  
22 input what they think we're doing is right or wrong. And we  
23 will respond to those. We are required to respond to all of  
24 those including section three (3) of the ROD. Long term



1 monitoring, operation and maintenance activities. We've got  
2 gate nineteen (19) landfill which is north of the firing  
3 line. And we are doing bi-annual monitoring of the ground  
4 water in that area and of the cap and we had creek problems  
5 which we installed in late '97 to meet the intent of RCRA.  
6 We have bi-annual inspections on those to make sure that  
7 they're still doing what they're supposed to be doing,  
8 provide a barrier for people coming in north of the firing  
9 line. Ah the future scenario for contaminated sites as I  
10 see it is that we always have to compare how we will clean  
11 up the property to no action. That is a federal  
12 requirement. And no action means we just don't do anything.  
13 That gives us a big zero (0) number to compare everything  
14 else to. And then there's institutional controls which can  
15 range from fencing in a site, deed restriction, and  
16 monitoring of the area to see if any condition is changed in  
17 that new say - say several trees in the contaminated area  
18 got blown down in that area. That might present a new  
19 exposure pathway and might do something else.  
20 Solidification and stabilization is the process where we try  
21 to bind up the chemicals in the soil to bring it down. Say  
22 it's contaminated with hazardous waste. We will try to  
23 solidify and stabilize it and make it cheaper weight and  
24 then haul it off site. Then there's just strictly excavated

1 and haul material off site or there's possible capping of  
2 sites that are feasibly large enough that it's cost  
3 effective to cap. If it's not large enough the most likely  
4 scenario will be to stabilize it into a - a special way and  
5 then haul it off site. Ah future scenarios for ground water  
6 again you got to compare it to no action. Institutional  
7 controls for ground water can be no monitoring wells  
8 installed in the contaminated plume, no pumping wells. That  
9 water would not be able to use - to be used for drinking  
10 purposes. Depending on the levels it could possibly be used  
11 for processing purposes. But given the yield that's out  
12 there that water is basically - can be pulled out very  
13 readily. Ah natural attenuation is where we don't do  
14 anything to the water. We just set there and watch it  
15 naturally biodegrade. We have to monitor it through that  
16 whole process though. Natural attenuation is a viable and  
17 the Army has to compare everything to natural attenuation  
18 also. That has to be one (1) of our feasibility ah  
19 criteria. And then there's the pump and treat which I think  
20 everybody has probably heard or we put in pumping wells,  
21 pull the water, treat it and discharge it. The Army don't  
22 like - the Army doesn't like to do those because they can be  
23 very costly and they can run on forever given the type place  
24 JPG has. Ah slide fourteen (14) ah success stories that we

1 have in creek crossings. It met the intent of RCRA which is  
2 to limit and put a good full barrier for people to know when  
3 they've crossed a line that they shouldn't have crossed.  
4 And we had to make it cost effective. And we succeeded in  
5 doing that. It was a small dollar amount as compared to  
6 what it could have been if some things would have happened.  
7 And then we had to make these creek crossings as maintenance  
8 free as possible because JPG doesn't have a large operation  
9 and maintenance budget for north of the line. And we had to  
10 make it easy for Phil here, our fence patching guy. So what  
11 we came up with was a series of cables strung across the  
12 creek and just common ordinary black corrugated piping down  
13 that you have off a drain. It won't shatter in cold  
14 weather. It will be able to take a few pot shots from our  
15 local gun - gun clubs. And the cost to replace that is  
16 minimal, very little. Phil can run up to a local store and  
17 get replacement parts. So that was our intent on the creek  
18 crossings. And UST - UST tanks we have about fifty-four  
19 (54) UST tank sites. And we've got about forty-nine (49)  
20 closed. There was a lot of USTs on the site. One (1) of  
21 the new sites we had we found just by driving by and saw a  
22 pipe sticking up and like what's this? We go to  
23 investigate. Ah the Army's goal is to transfer the property  
24 south of the firing line as quickly as possible. To

1 transfer the property that is protective of human health and  
2 the environment. To conduct the environmental clean-up in a  
3 timely and cost effective manner to benefit the tax payers.  
4 Any questions? I might have some answers. I might not. I  
5 will give it a shot. Okay.

6  
7 **MR. TIM MALONEY:**

8 Brooks do you have the results of the ground  
9 water sampling and could those be provided to the RAB for -  
10 from the beginning to the present?

11  
12 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

13 For Gate nineteen (19)? Or just for the  
14 whole --

15  
16 **MR. TIM MALONEY:**

17 Well all of them.

18  
19 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

20 All of them? Yeah. That will be coming out  
21 in phase II RI which will be coming. The RAB will get a  
22 copy of that.

1                   **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

2                               In August.

3  
4                   **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

5                               In August that will be coming out. Ah we  
6 have - there's three (3) sites we have ground water  
7 contamination in. And that's the old solvent pit at  
8 buildings 617, 602 and 279. 279 is one (1) well  
9 contamination. It's just a localized spot that's right next  
10 to the solvent pit. Ah when we do soil removal there we  
11 will probably take care of the ground water problem there.  
12 It's right next to the soil. And once we dig the soil out  
13 the ground water might pull in, plume in and release it.  
14 The other two (2) sites are fairly large plumes. But  
15 there's no drinking wells in the near vicinity and migration  
16 is extremely slow of TCE.

17  
18                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

19                               What?

20  
21                   **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

22                               TCE is the main problem.  
23  
24

1           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

2                   Trichloroethylene.

3  
4           **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

5                   Trichloroethylene. Okay. Thank you.

6  
7           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

8                   Thank you Brooks. Ah the next section I  
9 would like to provide an update on the UXO removal status in  
10 the cantonment area. If you ah open your handout to that  
11 section the first page basically talks about the fact that  
12 there was an archive search report done by the Corps of  
13 Engineers back in 1995 and how many acres they identified in  
14 the cantonment area that had a potential for UXO. It also  
15 states that what the Army is doing as far as how far below  
16 the surface they are clearing. And anything below that  
17 depth would be the responsibility of the user of the  
18 property. The next slide shows the time line schedule ah  
19 that we are following for this removal action. Currently  
20 there are two (2) actions that are in progress. One (1) is  
21 the airfield and then one (1) on the east side of the  
22 Proving Ground south of the Krueger Lake area. The one (1)  
23 at the airfield started last summer. It is still going on.  
24 There are a few grids that we still have to finish there.

1 And then there's about ah - four (4) or five (5) months  
2 after that they started on the east side of Krueger Lake and  
3 are working that area. Both efforts will probably finish up  
4 this year. The airfield area probably late summer, early  
5 fall and the Krueger Lake area probably late fall or by the  
6 end of the year. Then after that if you look at the time  
7 line you can see that that will leave just one (1) area  
8 which is on the west side of the airfield. The money for  
9 that should be available in fiscal year 1999 which starts 1  
10 October of this year. I've got - received indications from  
11 the Army that the necessary funding will be available for  
12 that and we will be starting to work there at that time.  
13 The next slide ah shows some of the results that we have  
14 obtained from ah the removal actions. The first parcel that  
15 we did was done back in 1996. We commonly refer to it as  
16 the hundred (100) acre parcel. It's a rectangular area of  
17 land south of the housing loop and you can see the amount of  
18 items we found there. With the exception of one (1) item  
19 everything was inert. And that only one (1) item was  
20 actually destroyed or blown up. Everything else was - they  
21 could pick up and didn't have to do anything on it. You can  
22 see they got a lot of scrap metal. The thirty (30) acre  
23 parcel is a couple of pie slices up in the northeast  
24 quadrant of the cantonment area. Basically BRAC - it's

1 Woodfield up in that area. That has been done. You can see  
2 the number of - of pieces of ordnance that we found there  
3 and also the scrap. The next area was just a surface  
4 clearance of this eight (8) acre parcel. This eight (8)  
5 acre parcel was a former mortar test range in the cantonment  
6 area some time ago. So we expected to find a lot of items  
7 there. And we did the surface clearance because we found  
8 that there were some items on the surface there. So that  
9 was - surface clearance was done back in the summer of 1996.  
10 You can see there were a large number of items found. Again  
11 only three (3) were suspected of being explosives. The next  
12 slide brings you just about up to date of where we are now.  
13 It talks about the airfield and these numbers for the  
14 airfield in the area south of Krueger Lake are current as of  
15 this week. Every week I get a report from the Huntsville  
16 Corps of Engineers ah and then I also share that with the  
17 State and EPA as to what's been found, what the status and  
18 where they expect to go and any issues or questions that  
19 have come up. And these numbers are current to this week.  
20 If you look at our web page you will see actual break up of  
21 these items and what the two hundred and forty (240) pieces  
22 are in the airfield. Whether they are mortars, mines, fuses  
23 or whatever. And the same for the area south of Krueger  
24 Lake. There's a table in the web site. In fact if you look



1 on one (1) of the poster boards here you will probably see  
2 it. The one (1) on the poster board is a little dated but  
3 it is not that far out of date. And then as I mentioned ah  
4 the last area we will start on is the area west of the  
5 airfield. Are there any questions concerning the removal of  
6 the unexploded ordnances in the cantonment area?  
7

8 **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

9 Paul? I have a question.  
10

11 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

12 Sure.  
13

14 **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

15 At the thirty (30) acre parcel site is that  
16 Woodfield Road?  
17

18 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

19 Yes.  
20

21 **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

22 Is that where the UXO are buried underneath  
23 that?  
24

1           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

2                       Yeah. And there were - there were about a  
3 half dozen items that we found under the road. And we have  
4 also dug holes in the road and removed them. But the holes  
5 have not been filled in yet.

6  
7           **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

8                       Okay. So that is complete?

9  
10          **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

11                      That will complete that area yes.

12  
13          **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

14                      So that's not considered - has that been  
15 considered cleared or not?

16  
17          **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

18                      We have not gotten a statement of clearance  
19 if that's what you --

20  
21          **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

22                      Okay.

1                   **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

2                   No. No statement of clearance has been  
3 received on it until we resolve the residual soil sample  
4 issue. Any other questions? Okay. What I would like to do  
5 now is turn the meeting over to Richard and he will talk  
6 about the status of the Technical Assistance for Public  
7 Participation Program and where we are. There are a number  
8 of slides that are available just to give you some  
9 background information on how that program came into being  
10 and what its intent is. I will let Richard tell you where  
11 we are and where RAB expects to go.

12  
13                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

14                   Thank you Paul. I'd like to go through  
15 these slides. We've been through them three (3) times now  
16 that I know of that I can think of. But I just want to  
17 bring you up to date on where we are ah just briefly. This  
18 TAPP Fund is Technical Assistance for Public Participation  
19 is - well some money made available for community RABs to  
20 use to help them in their flow in overseeing particularly  
21 activities at places like JPG. So back in April ah we had -  
22 I called together a meeting of district community RAB  
23 members in which we had I believe it was seven (7). I  
24 didn't bring my notes with me. So I'm sure we had seven (7)

1 people there, community RAB members which does constitute a  
2 majority. And we all decided to unanimously to ah pursue  
3 TAPP funding to help us ah in interpretation of technical  
4 problems is essentially what we had on there. So - and I  
5 also at that - and right after that meeting I typed up a  
6 memo and sent it out to all the community RAB members  
7 including the ones that weren't there in case they had any  
8 input ah that we wouldn't have heard because they weren't  
9 there. And explained to them - it was more or less I guess  
10 you could say minutes of the meeting. I took a few notes at  
11 the meeting and typed up what we talked about and what we  
12 had decided and I mailed them out to everybody and ah didn't  
13 really get any comments, any other comments from people that  
14 weren't there. Ah so I proceeded to go ahead as suggested  
15 or demanded by the other RAB members to ah type out the  
16 actual application itself which I did and mailed that out to  
17 all the community RAB members and asked them for their input  
18 in any you know wishings or additions or corrections or  
19 anything that they thought might need to be changed from  
20 what I had. I added a few very good recommendations from -  
21 from a few RAB members and incorporated their suggestions  
22 into what - what I already had. And then after that ah at  
23 the next regular RAB meeting which would have been in May ah  
24 I gave a copy of that what we had come up with to Paul for

1 any recommendations he might have also and he passed that  
2 along. And I've been getting some comments back from - who  
3 is that now?  
4

5 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

6 From the Army Environmental Center.  
7

8 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

9 Okay. Of just some suggestions ah and I  
10 will just go over them right now you know what those  
11 suggestions were. First it starts off with being sorry for  
12 the long delay and comments that this person has been out of  
13 the office ah working on other things. But it says  
14 generally the draft looks fine. If you haven't already gone  
15 forward with the application here is a couple of  
16 observations to be incorporated or discarded as you see fit.  
17 Ah one (1) thing was - one (1) item it suggested that - oh  
18 there's - there's a place on the application where it asks  
19 something. I can't remember exactly how it's worded but it  
20 wants to know ah - I can't remember the question but my  
21 answer was that the majority of the RAB agreed to seek this  
22 funding. That was what my ans - the ultimate answer to the  
23 question. And ah here he suggests that it might be better  
24 to cite the date of the specific RAB meeting. Okay we did

1 that. And ah quote - quote from the meeting minutes and  
2 that sort of thing. So I did that. I just expanded that  
3 answer to show that which I just talked about a little bit  
4 ago. Ah on another item in - okay one (1) of the questions  
5 on there had to do with ah what you - what this money does.  
6 I left this part out. It would - ah could be used to hire a  
7 third party to interpret ah some of these technical  
8 documents for the community RAB members. And one (1) thing  
9 we had to put in the application is that fact you know, what  
10 we wanted the money for and kind of a - he suggested a time  
11 line of what we wanted this third party to do and when we  
12 wanted them to do it. And so the suggestion here was that  
13 (reading) the info generally looks good. I think though  
14 the intent was to also be more detailed about the  
15 contractors' proposed work which could be used to flush out  
16 a statement of work (to include rough schedule and specific  
17 deliverables). Since this is all completely hinged on the  
18 RI contractors' schedule you could indicate for example a  
19 presentation with fact sheets, summary papers to be given at  
20 the closest RAB meeting immediately following regulatory  
21 comments resolution on the final document such as phase II  
22 RI or eco risk assessment or increasing the environmental  
23 remediation work plan etc. I don't know if you've had a  
24 chance to discuss with the RAB specifically what form of

1 information or recitation they'll be looking for but I  
2 believe that sort of details what is being requested here.  
3 I think that's what we had in mind. That they would - I  
4 mentioned in the answer to that question that - that the  
5 third party would meet with us but this is just getting a  
6 little more specific that they should prepare summaries and  
7 at least some general time line of when we want the  
8 summaries delivered to us by the third party. And I think  
9 that that's something that - that's what we wanted to do but  
10 I just didn't quite state it all exactly like that. So I  
11 can put those other details in there. And I don't think I  
12 will be varying from the intent that we had originally come  
13 up with. I don't know if they want more. Can we just say  
14 that we want - in your opinion that we want ah the summary  
15 to be delivered to us in a timely manner so that we can  
16 consider it before various dead lines? Or do you think we  
17 should actually state some dead lines?

18  
19 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

20 I think it should be tied to a dead line  
21 that would be normal to say a review of a document like the  
22 phase II RI. If you say you assume that the phase II RI  
23 comes out for normal review in August of this year and  
24 there's like sixty (60) or ninety (90) days, it would look

1 for something from the contractor during or just at the end  
2 of that period so that it doesn't delay the project.

3  
4 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

5 Un-huh (yes).  
6

7 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

8 Something along that line.  
9

10 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

11 Un-huh (yes).  
12

13 **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

14 I suggest Richard that you would want to  
15 give the contractor a specific date or tie it to a specific  
16 event.  
17

18 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

19 Un-huh (yes).  
20

21 **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

22 You want a document either on such and such  
23 a date or forty-five (45) days or ten (10) days after  
24 release of a document or something like that that's tied to



1 Brooks' schedule. Give them a specific target. You don't  
2 want to tell them as soon as possible.

3  
4 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

5 Right.

6  
7 **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

8 Because then you - if they fail to deliver  
9 at that point then you get into what was as soon as possible  
10 or in a timely manner?

11  
12 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

13 Un-huh (yes).

14  
15 **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

16 So lock them in to a date or an event is  
17 what would be my suggestion.

18  
19 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

20 And that's what I was trying to get to that  
21 you want to - it has to be keyed to a document and to either  
22 a - an interval after that document's available or to a  
23 specific date.

1                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

2                   Un-huh (yes).

3  
4                   **MR. BILL CORNING:**

5                   Doesn't that - isn't that final date that  
6                   you're talking about in August? So we probably won't get  
7                   accepted for this by August.

8  
9                   **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

10                  I don't know what the time frame is right  
11                  now on the processing of these applications. When I get  
12                  this one (1) back I will - go ahead.

13  
14                  **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

15                  No. Brooks has something.

16  
17                  **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

18                  That - the phase II RI report will come out  
19                  like three (3) times. There's a draft RI, draft final RI  
20                  and then final. So you will have plenty of time. If it  
21                  doesn't get approved by the draft RI, the draft final then  
22                  comes out which will be after we've gone through response  
23                  and comments, negotiate with the EPA and IDEM on how we  
24                  answered their questions on the draft review, you all will

1 still be able to get that document reviewed because that  
2 draft final goes back to IDEM and EPA to review again and  
3 make sure all their comments were incorporated.

4  
5 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

6 It's not a one (1) time shot.

7  
8 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

9 It's not a one (1) time shot. There will be  
10 three (3) times.

11  
12 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

13 Un-huh (yes).

14  
15 **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

16 In fact it would be to your advantage not to  
17 structure that as a one (1) time shot.

18  
19 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

20 No.

21  
22 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

23 And you would want --  
24

1           **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

2                     You would want to make it an intricate  
3 process.

4  
5           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

6                     As the document comes out.

7  
8           **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

9                     As the document evolves.

10  
11          **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

12                    -- whether it's the RI or the FS.

13  
14          **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

15                    Yeah.

16  
17          **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

18                    Then when we get into the actual design of  
19 various remediation or clean up ah projects you would want  
20 it keyed to those. So it would be more than - don't say  
21 just one (1) document.

22  
23          **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

24                    Yeah. Right.

1           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

2                       Say multiple ones. I hope that answers your  
3 question.

4  
5           **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

6                       I think so. Yeah.

7  
8           **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

9                       And doesn't that money expire and they've  
10 got to reapply in '99?

11  
12          **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

13                      I think it has to be applied for every  
14 fiscal year. So you may want to get everything and make it  
15 effective for FY '99.

16  
17          **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

18                      Yeah.

19  
20          **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

21                      I will check on that in the next few days  
22 and I can get back to you on how that works.

1           **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

2                       Yeah.

3  
4           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

5                       What would be the best for RAB - you know --

6  
7           **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

8                       That would be October?

9  
10          **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

11                      October 1 is when the new FY starts for the  
12 government.

13  
14          **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

15                      Yeah.

16  
17          **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

18                      What you will find is you will want to tell  
19 the contractor we need these reports reviewed, the project  
20 summary sheet in forty-five (45) days so it would be like  
21 the what? The draft will probably be done the day - the  
22 draft final RI report, the final RI report, the draft  
23 feasibility report, the draft final feasibility report. You  
24 will want him to review all those and deliver some sort of

1 summary to you all with questions, with comments on what you  
2 think might be appropriate or might not be appropriate.

3  
4 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

5 And you think within forty-five (45) days of  
6 their release is - is reasonable?

7  
8 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

9 Yeah. We - on major documents like that we  
10 request a sixty (60) day review of the State and EPA. So  
11 forty-five (45) to sixty (60) days. You will obviously need  
12 some time back.

13  
14 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

15 Yeah.

16  
17 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

18 So that's why the folks said forty-five  
19 (45). It will give you a couple of weeks to see what he's  
20 provided to you and still get in to us within ah the sixty  
21 (60) day request review period.

22  
23 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

24 I'm not expecting any comments from EPA and

1 IDEM from the draft RI until probably late September or  
2 early-mid October.

3  
4 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

5 Un-huh (yes).  
6

7 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

8 So that's sixty (60) days right there.  
9

10 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

11 If that long.  
12

13 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

14 Un-huh (yes).  
15

16 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

17 So it would take - it takes a long time to  
18 gather data and information from 1989 through 1996 or  
19 something like that. That's why they make these things  
20 happen. That's why it's going to be a bear.  
21

22 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

23 Yeah.  
24



1           **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

2                       Does the Army have an idea of how long it  
3 would take to approve it?  
4

5           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

6                       I don't know at this point. This is still  
7 an evolving process. I think a few have been processed but  
8 as to how far I don't know. That's one (1) of the things I  
9 will try to find out within the next couple of days when I  
10 get back to the office. We have a meeting down in  
11 Washington next week. If I can't find out by Friday or  
12 Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of next week I will  
13 have ample opportunity to find the answer to that question.  
14 And I can get back to you then Richard.  
15

16          **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

17                      Okay. Did you have something else?  
18

19          **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

20                      The Tuesday's meeting, Paul's meeting  
21 Tuesday is with the Army's entire environmental structure  
22 for base closures. So if you don't have the answer Tuesday  
23 afternoon we've got a real problem.  
24

1           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

2                   That's an accurate statement.

3  
4           **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

5                   Somebody there should know.

6  
7           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

8                   All my counterparts for all the Army BRAC  
9 facilities plus major commands plus the Pentagon people will  
10 all be there. This happens about twice a year. And this  
11 one (1) is going to happen next week in D.C. So if they  
12 don't have the answer we're in trouble.

13  
14          **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

15                  Okay. A couple more - three (3) more items  
16 here concerning this. The - next on this is item - question  
17 number nine (9). It was on there. I didn't bring the  
18 question so I am having to read the answers to figure out  
19 what the questions were. Ah okay this is one (1) that I  
20 thought we answered - that the question actually should have  
21 been answered in another question. Ah here it's suggesting  
22 to include in this answer an explanation for the primary  
23 rationale for a - that we - for the provider such as  
24 interpretation of tech - technical documents. And that is

1 an approved use. And I said that two (2) or three (3) other  
2 places but I guess it's recommended that I put it in that  
3 one (1) too so I already stuck it in in that question. Ah  
4 and then item ten (10) as far as we were supposed to - I  
5 remember this question. We were supposed to list any  
6 particular expertise that we were looking for in a third  
7 party. The thing that the RAB had agreed on was to be sure  
8 to include that we would really prefer the third party to  
9 have ah knowledge of the ah environment of the area of  
10 southeastern Indiana, Jefferson County and Ripley County.  
11 You know this - this area. Here he suggests that ah  
12 specific more qualifications would be useful. If we  
13 mentioned more that would be useful. Specific criteria  
14 could be an experienced RI/FS contractor or risk assessor or  
15 familiarity with base closure processes. Ah familiarity  
16 with federal facilities in general, knowledge of southern  
17 Indiana geology, hydro geology, etc. So since I - I was  
18 sure of what we had originally put in the application I did  
19 go along with the suggestion about ah knowledge of southern  
20 Indiana geology and hydro geology. I went ahead and felt  
21 free to add that. So I just wanted to point that one (1)  
22 that we talked about. I didn't list - that's about all that  
23 I had. Do any of the community RAB members have any  
24 comments on those other specific suggestions that are in

1 here? Okay. Thank you.

2  
3 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

4 Mike?

5  
6 **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

7 I will just throw in a suggestion if I can  
8 to ask Krista and Karen what type of staff do you - will you  
9 engage in your reviews? What kind of technical staffs will  
10 the regulators have that they may want to also have to get  
11 an opinion from?

12  
13 **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

14 You mentioned the risk assessment. What -  
15 what others? What others did you mention?

16  
17 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

18 Okay. And I think I did had risk assessment  
19 in - in also because I thought that was important.

20  
21 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

22 That would be good.

1           **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

2                   Geology?

3  
4           **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

5                   Geology and hydro geology.

6  
7           **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

8                   Let's see. Geologists and hydro geologists.  
9                   Someone that has a knowledge of base closure processes. I -  
10                  I'm not sure that's that important for what we want to know.

11  
12           **MS. KRISTA DUNCAN:**

13                   Well I want to say it's more important if  
14                  the geologist has a remediation or clean up type background  
15                  because you get a lot of them that are in the petroleum  
16                  industries and you see if we hired them on at the State  
17                  there's a big training that's going to occur between  
18                  petroleum industry versus you know like oil-gas exploration  
19                  background to our remediation background. So that would be  
20                  my only suggestion.

21  
22           **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

23                   That's - that's a good suggestion because I  
24                  - I mean - yeah.

1                   **MS. KRISTA DUNCAN:**

2                   The only thing --

3  
4                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

5                   I know several geologists. You know there's  
6 three (3) at Hanover College. One (1), he says all I know  
7 is what rocks are. You know that's what I do. And so you  
8 don't want somebody like that. Yeah.

9  
10                  **MS. KRISTA DUNCAN:**

11                  Really kind of a mix between geology and  
12 chemistry to be able to do that.

13  
14                  **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

15                  Soil chemistry.

16  
17                  **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

18                  And a chemist. I'm sure Hanover has a few  
19 of those.

20  
21                  **MS. KRISTA DUNCAN:**

22                  Yeah. And somebody with not just a total  
23 lab background but somebody who can also talk about safety  
24 transport, how chemicals interact with the soil and the

1 environment.

2  
3 **MR. PHIL MANN:**

4 People want to know what they are going to  
5 do with the information after you get it? What decisions  
6 are based on the RAB understanding of that?

7  
8 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

9 Okay. If - the way we looked at it is that  
10 we - we just totally don't understand the technical data.  
11 We can't make any kind of intelligent questions or input  
12 into the project. Like we wouldn't know if they were going  
13 to do something that was totally outrageous. We couldn't  
14 say that's totally outrageous.

15  
16 **MR. PHIL MANN:**

17 And they need to stop that?

18  
19 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

20 I'm not sure about that no. We did not know  
21 to disagree that it was necessarily wrong.

22  
23 **MR. PHIL MANN:**

24 Aren't all the processes to take place

1 already scheduled? Aren't they all going to happen?

2  
3 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

4 No.

5  
6 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

7 No.

8  
9 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

10 Not at all.

11  
12 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

13 We're not there yet.

14  
15 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

16 We have not gotten to the state of the clean  
17 up of the Proving Ground where we know exactly what we're  
18 going to do at each one (1) of the sites. Because the first  
19 thing we have to do is identify what's there and where it is  
20 there, how much it's there. Once you've agreed on that, and  
21 that's not only us but the State and the EPA, then you  
22 propose like Brooks went into the various means that you can  
23 use to clean that up. Sometimes you don't do anything. But  
24 that is something that goes out and it's not only made



1 available to the regulators for comments but also to the  
2 public in the thirty (30) day Record of Decision. Then you  
3 go out and you design those mechanisms to go build.  
4 Sometimes you don't have to design stuff. Sometimes it's a  
5 backhoe that you go scoop up some dirt with. And sometimes  
6 you do design it.

7  
8 **MR. PHIL MANN:**

9 And these decisions are --

10  
11 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

12 But all those steps in that process are one  
13 (1) by one (1) in series. And each one (1) of those steps  
14 are made available to the public and regulators to review  
15 and comment on. But none of those decisions have been made  
16 yet.

17  
18 **MR. PHIL MANN:**

19 All right.

20  
21 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

22 We have some generic general ideas but  
23 nothing has been decided upon. Nothing has been formalized  
24 or even proposed yet with the exception of some of the few

1 sites that we have taken some dirt upon. The majority of  
2 the sites no.

3  
4 **MR. PHIL MANN:**

5 And all this has to do with property that's  
6 already sold?

7  
8 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

9 I beg your pardon?

10  
11 **MR. PHIL MANN:**

12 All the RAB sites or all the information  
13 that has to do with property that's already been purchased  
14 by Mr. Ford?

15  
16 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

17 It's all within his approximate thirty-four  
18 hundred (3400) acres, that's correct. All the fifty (50) RI  
19 sites are within that thirty-four hundred (3400) acres.

20  
21 **MR. BOB HUDSON:**

22 What about gate nineteen (19)?  
23  
24

1           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

2                   All right. I take that back. You're right  
3 Bob. One (1). Gate nineteen (19) really is not.

4  
5           **MR. BOB HUDSON:**

6                   279 and 617?

7  
8           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

9                   279 is not. They're not one (1) of the -  
10 well they are one (1) of the RI sites but they're not.

11  
12          **MR. BOB HUDSON:**

13                   Well they are similar.

14  
15          **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

16                   Yeah.

17  
18          **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

19                   As we move through the - after we get  
20 through the RI in the feasibility study report we will  
21 develop so many areas of mediation goals. That means we  
22 will clean sites up too. And we have - those have to be  
23 protective of ecology and human health. Those are two (2)  
24 numbers that we will pull and that's human health and

1 ecology. With those numbers we will get an idea of how much  
2 contamination we'll have to clean up and that's where the  
3 feasibility study comes in. It has to be nine (9) ARODS.  
4 Okay? Applicable, relevant, and appropriate remediation.  
5 It's an ugly term.

6  
7 **MS. KRISTA DUNCAN:**

8 We do a requirement that other media like  
9 water and air already have in existence that we apply to a  
10 site.

11  
12 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

13 To a cite to make sure that we're really  
14 protective of those things. And depending on how much soil  
15 we actually have to clean up based on the preliminary  
16 remediation goals will dictate - give us a number that is  
17 best. At Joliet we are not taking the cheapest method to  
18 clean that site up because preferential is to treat the soil  
19 instead of just digging it into a landfill. Dig and haul it  
20 to a landfill. So we are going to treat a hundred and  
21 eighty-one thousand (181,000) cubic yards of soil there.  
22 It's a little more costly method than just dig and haul but  
23 RAB didn't want us to dig and haul it. The regulators  
24 didn't want us to dig and haul it. And the Army's

1 preference was not to just dig and haul. Their preference  
2 was for us to treat the soil and put it back in the hole.  
3 So we're going to treat this soil and we're going to put it  
4 back in the hole so we're not going over here and digging  
5 another hundred and eighty-one thousand (181,000) cubic  
6 yards of soil to put it in the hole. That's what all comes  
7 through the feasibility study. And that's where you all  
8 will need those people to help you. Yeah these mediation  
9 goals are protecting and they should protect the human  
10 health and ecological aspect of Mr. Ford's property.

11  
12 **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

13 Richard?

14  
15 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

16 Yes?

17  
18 **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

19 I would also like to add you will get to the  
20 stage of the remedial action in which you develop clean up  
21 numbers. You would want to have an engineer, probably a  
22 civil engineer and/or a geo-technical engineer because they  
23 will be involved with the fill work of the excavation of the  
24 soil, the remedial design, when you decide how you are going

1 to clean the sites up such as what Brooks has mentioned  
2 using a pump and treat system or some other type of design.  
3

4 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

5 Civil and/or what kind of engineer?  
6

7 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

8 Geo-tech.  
9

10 **MS. KAREN MASON-SMITH:**

11 Geo-technical.  
12

13 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

14 Are we going to be able to get all this in  
15 here?  
16

17 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

18 Some of the larger companies - some of the  
19 larger companies have a great deal of expertise. One (1)  
20 last thing I would add to that is ah it's associated and  
21 related to BRAC, but it's not just a generic BRAC facility.  
22 It's more you would want the people that are doing the  
23 review to also factor in, once they've looked at what is  
24 being proposed and what numbers are being proposed to be

1 cleaned up, how that applies to the projected reuse of the  
2 property. Because you know there are going to be different  
3 numbers relevant and applicable to different types of reuse.  
4 If the reuse is going to be residential it would be one (1)  
5 set of criteria. But if it's going to be industrial it  
6 would be a different set of criteria. So I would suggest  
7 you put that in your list of ah tasks to the contractor that  
8 that would be one (1) thing that they would air any  
9 suggested clean up levels to is also compare that and  
10 comment on if it's appropriate for the projected reuse of  
11 the property.

12  
13 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

14 This will be like a thirty (30) foot shelf  
15 of books that we were applying for the money for somebody to  
16 tell us what that thirty (30) foot shelf of books tells us.

17  
18 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

19 Yeah.

20  
21 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

22 Because we don't know all these terms used -  
23 that you've used here. Ninety (90) percent of them I don't  
24 know what they're talking about.

1                   **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

2                   And trust me. I get confused reading it  
3 myself.

4  
5                   **MR. BILL CORNING:**

6                   And I'm one (1) of the people on the RAB.  
7 Some of them are smarter than I am and some of them I guess  
8 might be but I don't know anybody that would be less  
9 smarter. I don't know.

10  
11                   **MR. BROOKE EVENS:**

12                   I would still apply for it.

13  
14                   **MR. BILL CORNING:**

15                   I would apply for the whole hundred thousand  
16 (\$100,000). Twenty-five thousand (\$25,000) won't get you in  
17 the front door with that.

18  
19                   **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

20                   Well twenty-five thousand (\$25,000) is the  
21 yearly ah limit right now. It's twenty-five thousand  
22 (\$25,000) or one (1) percent of the annual budget for an  
23 individual facility, whichever is the lesser amount.



1                   **MR. BILL CORNING:**

2                   But you see what I'm talking about. What we  
3 were talking about at that meeting.

4  
5                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

6                   Un-huh (yes).

7  
8  
9                   **MR. BILL CORNING:**

10                  At JPG. That somebody would explain to us  
11 what this thirty (30) foot of books --

12  
13                  **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

14                  And that's what this process - this is what  
15 this program was generally for. Because Jefferson is not  
16 alone.

17  
18                  **MR. BILL CORNING:**

19                  But it's so far above our heads.

20  
21                  **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

22                  The Jefferson is not alone out there. There  
23 are a lot of BRAC facilities. Almost every BRAC facility in  
24 the RAB associated with them are in the same situation. So

1 that's why this process and this program were developed and  
2 initiated. And it's just starting off now. So don't feel  
3 that you - you know that Jefferson is unique because it's  
4 not. It's the norm.

5  
6 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

7 You actually got good resource in this area.  
8 You've got Hanover College. You've got a geologist. They  
9 might not understand a whole lot but engineering  
10 intelligence they know people that they can call on. A  
11 chemist is going to know if they've got biologists there  
12 that are probably familiar with risks. They might not be  
13 current but you can probably figure that those professions  
14 are going to go out and probably charge fifty (\$50) to sixty  
15 dollars (\$60) an hour to review this and probably take them  
16 forty (40) hours. So you can probably get most of this done  
17 with about twenty-five hundred (\$2500) I would imagine.

18  
19 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

20 Well we thought that we - we suggested I  
21 think on the original that somebody from Hanover College  
22 because through the years, and I don't remember the  
23 professor's name, but there's been a couple of professors  
24 that have brought their classes on to the Proving Ground to

1 do studies.

2  
3 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

4 And they could still do that.

5  
6 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

7 Therefore they would have a good background.

8  
9 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

10 Right. That would be a good start. I think  
11 that would be a good start.

12  
13 **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

14 Well now that - that brings me to the final  
15 part here and it fits in exactly with that. Is that when we  
16 first filled out the application we did contact a couple of  
17 professors at Hanover, both of which were going to be gone  
18 for the summer. But they are going to be back soon now. I  
19 mean August is going to be here before we know it.

20  
21 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

22 Right and schools starts middle of August.

1                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

2                   Because we, the Rab met and when we talked  
3                   at the April meeting ah the idea was to list Hanover as one  
4                   (1) possible ah provider. And then we thought well we need  
5                   to get this done as soon as we can so maybe we shouldn't do  
6                   that because they're going to be gone for three (3) months.  
7                   But that three (3) months is a little more than half over  
8                   now. We know we're not going to get these done and the  
9                   money and everything in before that. So we could go ahead  
10                  and list Hanover because one (1) of the comments - one (1)  
11                  of the suggestions that was made was that well he didn't  
12                  know if we missed that page or - or what because we didn't  
13                  put anything in. So - but we could list --

14  
15                  **MR. BILL CORNING:**

16                  I would list Hanover.

17  
18                  **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

19                  Hanover. That's a possible idea.

20  
21                  **MR. BILL CORNING:**

22                  Because they know more about it than anybody  
23                  they could bring in from anyplace else in the country.

1                   **MS. KRISTA DUNCAN:**

2                   I would just like to emphasize and make sure  
3 they do have a remediation or other background.  
4

5                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

6                   Yes. I have that down.  
7

8                   **MS. KRISTA DUNCAN:**

9                   That's really going to be key rather than  
10 having someone learn as they read the document.  
11

12                  **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

13                  Right.  
14

15                  **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

16                  And there are numerous consulting firms down  
17 in Louisville, Indianapolis, Cincinnati that if you just  
18 limited say I need you to read, review this report for a  
19 lump sum amount and give us an executive summary, what's in  
20 it? It would probably be upwards of two thousand (\$2,000)  
21 or twenty-four hundred (\$2400) maybe, a good forty (40)  
22 hours to review it and give you something. And do bids.  
23 Just send them a letter and you need them to review this and  
24 what it costs and they will send the proposals back and we

1 will be able to do this and this and this. The power plant.  
2 The guys - if there's an environmentalist at the power  
3 plant, engineers, civil engineer at the power plant down  
4 there, give them a call. He would know a lot of regulations  
5 and other stuff most likely. There's a GE plant around here  
6 isn't there?

7  
8 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

9 What?

10  
11 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

12 A GE plant?

13  
14 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

15 Cincinnati.

16  
17 **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

18 Isn't there a plant in North Vernon  
19 somewhere?

20  
21 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

22 No.

1 meeting is in North Vernon at the Public Library on  
2 September 9th at 7:00 P.M. We encourage you to come and  
3 hopefully we will have some additional news on various  
4 developments in the RI, maybe where Fish and Wildlife stands  
5 and some other things also. Thank you very much.

6 \* \* \* \* \*

7 CONCLUSION OF HEARING  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

1                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

2                   Un-huh (yes). So I think all we've done  
3 here tonight is fill in some of the gaps.

4  
5                   **MR. BILL CORNING:**

6                   At least we've gone farther in depth on this  
7 than we knew about.

8  
9                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

10                  Yeah. Okay. I will do that and get it  
11 together and pass it along and see where it goes. Okay.

12  
13                  **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

14                  Okay. Richard you give it to me and I will  
15 staff it and get it processed up the chain. If there are  
16 any things I need to know then I will get back to you. But  
17 we will take care of it once you give it to me. The last  
18 item on the agenda other than the open discussion and the  
19 closing remarks is what was going to be a short presentation  
20 on the Internet web site for Jefferson. I did have access  
21 to the Internet here tonight until the projector decided not  
22 to cooperate. But fortunately I had printed out at - at our  
23 office a number of the pages that are actually on the web  
24 site. They are on these poster boards here. The handout in



1 the slides here does give you the - the address on the  
2 Internet. It's had about six hundred (600) visitors since  
3 it came up on the Internet two (2) months ago. I'm starting  
4 to make some changes now. It does have the opportunity to  
5 ah not only provide comments to us but also has a number of  
6 e-mail addresses and it has a number of links to other web  
7 sites, not only to the Hoosier Environmental and Save the  
8 Valley but the U. S. Fish and Wildlife and EPA, IDEM. I I  
9 mean there must be thirty (30) or forty (40) different web  
10 sites that you can connect to directly from ours. So we are  
11 very interested in having you look at it and also to make  
12 suggestions on what you would like to see added or changed  
13 as you thought appropriate. Other than that I don't have  
14 anything else right now. If there are any questions on what  
15 we've talked about tonight, you know generic or general  
16 questions, that's the time we've come to now. So does  
17 anyone have any questions?

18  
19 **MR. BILL CORNING:**

20 I have a statement.

21  
22 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

23 Go ahead Bill.  
24

1           **MR. BILL CORNING:**

2                       We've had several people over at the  
3 Historic Hoosier Hills that have - what do you call it, hit?  
4

5           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

6                       Yes.  
7

8           **MR. BILL CORNING:**

9                       Hit the web site?   And they were very  
10 impressed with it.   They - they thought it was a fantastic  
11 web site.  
12

13          **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

14                      Thank you.  
15

16          **MR. BROOKS EVENS:**

17                      Good.  
18

19          **MR. TIM MALONEY:**

20                      We have a large site and it is good.  
21

22          **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

23                      Yes.   We - we tried to be as comprehensive  
24 and detailed as we could.   It took quite a while longer than

1 we thought it was. And it's a fairly large site. There are  
2 over a hundred (100) pages to it. But it ah - it gives a  
3 lot of the history and the mission and the background and  
4 goes to the environment and the reuse and the natural and  
5 cultural resources. It's - it's fairly comprehensive. It  
6 talks about the BRAC clean up team which is Krista Duncan  
7 from the Indiana Department of Environmental Management now  
8 on. She replaced John Manley. And Karen Mason-Smith from  
9 the EPA with me form the BRAC clean up team. We all - they  
10 have all our names and addresses and e-mail addresses where  
11 you can get a hold of us via that method. Bob?

12  
13 **MR. BOB HUDSON:**

14 Can I ask if they fired John?

15  
16 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

17 No. I don't want to speak too much for  
18 IDEM. Krista do you want to tell them?

19  
20 **MS. KRISTA DUNCAN:**

21 No. He - John had to take over two (2)  
22 other sites, Grissom Air Force base and Ft. Bennett. So I  
23 got transferred to JPG. So he's still working for the  
24 State. I'll let him know that somebody asked about him.

1           **MR. BOB HUDSON:**

2                   Tell him I asked that question.

3

4           **MS. KRISTA DUNCAN:**

5                   Okay.

6

7           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

8                   Be sure and tell him Bob Hudson asked you.

9           He knows Bob.

10

11           **MS. KRISTA DUNCAN:**

12                   Okay.

13

14           **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

15                   Any other questions?

16

17           **MR. PHIL MANN:**

18                   Any news on the Fish and Wildlife Service?

19

20           **MR. MIKE EARLY:**

21                   There is no news on the Fish and Wildlife  
22           Service. They have had ah meetings of their staff at the  
23           region who has briefed the director of the Fish and Wildlife  
24           Service. They support the efforts of the refuge. We have

1 not yet received a proposal from the Fish and Wildlife  
2 Service. And we don't know when we will receive a proposal  
3 from the Fish and Wildlife Service. About a week and a half  
4 (1½) ago I spoke with Congressman Hamilton's chief of staff  
5 and they are encouraging Fish and Wildlife to get along with  
6 sending the proposal to the Army. So we expect that we will  
7 receive one (1) soon. We will have a brief meeting with ah  
8 Fish and Wildlife tomorrow and that will be probably the  
9 first question, maybe the second question, that I will be  
10 asking the representatives from the Fish and Wildlife  
11 Service that will be here in the region. It's still active  
12 within Fish and Wildlife. That is in fact why they're  
13 visiting tomorrow. So we don't know when we're going to get  
14 a proposal.

15  
16 **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

17 Any other questions? I don't have any  
18 closing remarks other than if you have not signed the  
19 attendance sheet please do so. If you know of anyone else  
20 that's interested please encourage them to either come or  
21 look at the web site. You can use that as a mechanism to  
22 ask questions or provide input on things that interest you  
23 or concern you at Jefferson. Richard?

1                   **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

2                   Ah I guess just as a matter of - of  
3 information I just learned yesterday that there's a  
4 significant portion of the cantonment area that I think Mr.  
5 Ford has requested to be zoned heavy industrial. It's not  
6 zoned at all right now from what I understand.

7  
8                   **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

9                   Right.

10  
11                  **MR. RICHARD HILL:**

12                  And I just - something I found out and I  
13 wanted to let people know you know. I just you know - I  
14 just heard about it and haven't looked into it any more than  
15 that. Don't know anything else. I mean I know that he has  
16 requested that. And that's just about all I know about it  
17 right now. I haven't in my own mind decided if it's totally  
18 appropriate thing that the whole area be requested or not.  
19 Maybe not. Maybe some part and not others. I just don't  
20 know. I just told you. That's it. Thanks for coming.

21  
22                  **MR. PAUL CLOUD:**

23                  I want to thank everyone also and if you  
24 look on the - on the bottom of the agenda sheet the next

1 meeting is in North Vernon at the Public Library on  
2 September 9th at 7:00 P.M. We encourage you to come and  
3 hopefully we will have some additional news on various  
4 developments in the RI, maybe where Fish and Wildlife stands  
5 and some other things also. Thank you very much.

6 \* \* \* \* \*

7 CONCLUSION OF HEARING  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24


C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF INDIANA )  
 ) SS:  
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON )

I, Sharon Shields, do hereby certify that I am a Notary Public in and for the County of Jefferson, State of Indiana, duly authorized and qualified to administer oaths; That the foregoing public hearing was taken by me in shorthand and on a tape recorder on July 8, 1998 in the Ripley Elementary School, Versailles, IN; That this public hearing was taken on behalf of the Jefferson Proving Ground Restoration Advisory Board pursuant to agreement for taking at this time and place; That the testimony of the witnesses was reduced to typewriting by me and contains a complete and accurate transcript of the said testimony.

I further certify that pursuant to stipulation by and between the respective parties, this testimony has been transcribed and submitted to the Jefferson Proving Ground Restoration Advisory Board.

WITNESS my hand and notarial seal this 16th day of July, 1998.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Shields, Notary Public  
Jefferson County, State of Indiana

My Commission Expires:

July 2, 1999